## **EXHIBIT A**

Pages 1 - 21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP, JUDGE WAYMO, LLC, ) ) Plaintiff, ) No. C 17-00939 WHA VS. ) UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., et al., Defendants. San Francisco, California Thursday, March 16, 2017 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS **APPEARANCES:** For Plaintiff: QUINN, EMANUEL, URQUHART & SULLIVAN LLP 50 California Street 22nd Floor San Francisco, California 94111 BY: CHARLES K. VERHOEVEN, ESQ. JORDAN R. JAFFE, ESQ. DAVID A. PERLSON, ESQ. MELISSA J. BAILY, ESQ. For Defendants: MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105 BY: ARTURO J. GONZALEZ, ESQ. MICHAEL A. JACOBS, ESQ. Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

(Appearances continued, next page)

| APPEARANCES, CONTINUED: |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Also Present:           | NICOLE T. BARTOW, ESQ.<br>Uber Director II, Litigation |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |
|                         |  |

```
Your Honor.
 1
                     Including that he won't take away -- you know,
 2
          THE COURT:
     he will honor the nondisclosure.
 3
         MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
 5
          THE COURT: All right. Well, then -- because your papers
     didn't say that. So, okay.
 6
         MR. VERHOEVEN: Well, we're not basing our claims on the
 7
      agreement, Your Honor. We're basing it on the law, and we're
 8
     basing it -- and our claims are asserted against people who are
 9
     not in our control. Uber and Otto are not subject to any
10
11
     agreement, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Okay. All right. What is your next point?
12
13
         MR. GONZALEZ: That was the only point I have, Your Honor.
      If I think of another one, I'll let you know. But that's it for
14
15
     now.
16
          THE COURT: Okay. How about on your side?
17
         MR. VERHOEVEN: No, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: Okay. This is great. Let me see if I have got
18
      anything to bring up with you.
19
20
          (The Court examines document)
          THE COURT: What day will you be back here on your motion
21
      for arbitration? Do you know when that will come up?
22
23
         MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, I'm anticipating that we will
      file it in about two weeks. And then in the ordinary course --
24
25
     what is that, 28 days?
```

```
Thirty-five..
 1
          THE COURT:
          MR. GONZALEZ: Oh, okay. Thirty-five.
 2
          THE COURT:
                     Twenty-eight is the old days. All right.
 3
                                                                 When
      will that -- do the math for me. When will that -- I want to
 4
 5
      know, will that come up before the preliminary-injunction
      hearing?
 6
                     That will put it roughly around May 4th, I
 7
          THE CLERK:
      believe, Your Honor.
 8
          MR. GONZALEZ: Yeah.
 9
          THE COURT: So --
10
11
          MS. BARTOW: We can file it sooner.
          THE COURT: I'm not -- I mean, I don't want to go through
12
      the pain and suffering of a preliminary injunction hearing if it
13
      has to be arbitrated, is the point. Think that through.
14
          But here's the other thing I want to you do. You asked for
15
16
      an early trial in your papers.
17
          MR. VERHOEVEN: Yes, Your Honor.
          THE COURT: What is your view on the early trial?
18
          MR. GONZALEZ: Your Honor, our view is that there's going to
19
      be a lot of work to be done on this case.
20
          THE COURT: Well, your view would probably change if there
21
      was a preliminary injunction.
22
          MR. GONZALEZ: It probably would.
23
          THE COURT: Yeah. So before you know the answer, I would
24
      like for both of you to meet and confer, and come up with a
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

schedule that would lead up to a trial on October -- first Monday in October, which is October 2. I could try this case if you could get it prepared and ready for trial on October 2nd. I'm talking about the final trial, not -- but that would mean doing a lot of homework between now and then. And it could be done, but it also -- I understand that it would be faster than normal. But while you both have an incentive before you know the answer on preliminary injunction, while you both have an incentive to possibly consider an early trial, I want you to work out that date, work out what the -- what the schedule would be for disclosure of experts and everything else, and then give that to me on the day you come back for your motion on the arbitration. Okay? MR. GONZALEZ: We will do that. Thank Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Here's another problem. I anticipate that there's a 50/50 chance -- and I could be wrong, but there's a 50/50 chance that whenever your side, meaning --MR. VERHOEVEN: Waymo. THE COURT: -- Waymo, wants to take the deposition of Mr. Lev- --Levandowski. MR. VERHOEVEN: -- Levandowski, that there will be a last-second THE COURT:

THE COURT: -- Levandowski, that there will be a last-second delay, because you say he needs separate counsel. That will not be good. So I want you -- you're on notice you need to be